

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU

WEDNESDAY, THE 7TH DAY OF JANUARY 2015/17TH POUSHA, 1936

WP(C).No.31021 of 2014 (C)

PETITIONER:

**PRADEEP,S/O.PRAKASAN,AGED 25 YEARS,
KULOORI HOUSE,PERAKAM VILLAGE,
PERAKAM DESOM,CHAVAKKAD TALUK,
THRISSUR DISTRICT.**

BY ADV. SRI.M.PREMCHAND

RESPONDENTS:

- 1. GURUVAYOOR MUNICIPALITY,
MUNICIPAL OFFICE,GURUVAYOOR.P.O.,
THRISSUR DISTRICT,REP. BY ITS SECRETARY,
PIN-680 101.**
- 2. THE SECRETARY,
GURUVAYOOR MUNICIPALITY,MUNICIPAL OFFICE,
GURUVAYOOR.P.O.,THRISSUR DISTRICT-680 101.**
- 3. K.R.CHANDRAN,AGED 55 YEARS,S/O.RAMAN,
KONDARAMVALAPPIL HOUSE,THAMARAYOOR,
KOTTAPPADI,CHAVAKKAD TALUK-680 505.**

R1 & R2 BY SRI.P.AAHAMMED,S.C.

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 07-01-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

pk

WP(C).No.31021 of 2014 (C)

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS:

**EXT.P1-TRUE COPY OF THE COMPLAINT DATED 16.10.2014 SUBMITTED BY THE
PETITIONER BEFORE THE 2ND RESPONDENT.**

EXT.P2-TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF THE RECEIPT DATED 16.10.2014.

RESPONDENT'S EXHIBITS: **NIL**

//TRUE COPY//

P.S. TO JUDGE

pk

DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU, J.

W.P.(c) No. 31021 of 2014

Dated this the 07th day of January, 2015

JUDGMENT

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Standing Counsel for the respondents, apart from perusing the record. Since the issue lies in a narrow compass, this Court proposes to dispose of the writ petition at the admission stage itself.

2. Briefly stated, the petitioner, an Auto rickshaw Driver by profession, has a grievance that the third respondent has constructed a building near the Auto rickshaw parking area. The said building is said to have been constructed without proper plan and sanction from the Municipality, thereby obstructing the activities of the petitioner and other Auto rickshaw drivers in conveniently parking their vehicles in the area earmarked for them. Ventilating his grievance, the petitioner is said to have

submitted Exhibit P1 representation to the second respondent, who is yet to dispose it of.

3. In the facts and circumstances, having regard to the respective submissions of the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Standing Counsel for the respondents, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the matter, this Court disposes of the present writ petition with a direction to the second respondent to consider Exhibit P1 representation of the petitioner in accordance with law, and pass appropriate orders thereon as expeditiously as possible, at any rate, within a period of one month from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment.

With the above observation, this writ petition is disposed of.

**DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU
JUDGE**

DMR/-